

## REMARKS

Claims 15-21 and 26-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kumar in view of Joffe. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kumar discloses high speed communication devices connected to a transmission line that can receive data through different states (high and normal impedance states). In particular, the high speed communication devices according to Kumar are in a normal impedance state when the transmitter of the communication device is coupled to the transmission line. In a high impedance transmission state, the transmitter is not coupled to the transmission line and the high speed communication device presents high impedance to the transmission line (paragraphs [0023], [0024]). Therefore, while in a high impedance state, the communication devices disclosed in Kumar can not transmit signals. They can merely receive signals from other transceivers transmitting on the same line (paragraph [0045]).

Kumar is directed at preventing several high speed communication devices (e.g. DSL modems) connected to the same line from interfering with each other. Therefore, whenever one device switches into a normal impedance state – which is necessary to transmit signals – the others will switch to (or stay in) a high impedance state. As can be seen from this explanation, switching from DSL modems still occurs in an arrangement as the one disclosed in Kumar. Hence, when switching from state to state, these modems will still interfere with other devices (e.g. an ISDN modem/phone) that are also connected to the specific transmission line. Thus, the negative effects caused by this interference between high speed communication devices (DSL modems) and ISDN phones, for example, can not be solved by the arrangement of Kumar. On the other hand, the instant invention overcomes this issue, among other things (see, for example, paragraph [0011] of the instant specification).

The Examiner states that Kumar teaches “the detected current operating state such that the input impedance of the first transmission unit is kept to an approximately constant value[,]” citing paragraph [0053] of Kumar. Applicants respectfully disagree with this statement. Rather, Kumar teaches that the different high speed communication units can check whether currently any of the other units is in normal state or not. If no unit is in a normal state (i.e. if no unit is transmitting signals), the respective communication unit can switch into a normal state to transmit signals itself. However, there are no means provided to keep the impedance on the

transmission line at a constant level: If all (high speed) communication units are in a high impedance state (the transmitters are not coupled to the line), the impedance present on the transmission line is noticeably different from the time when one communication unit is in a normal impedance state (when its transmitter is coupled to the line). Again, the switching between the states causes interference on the line and disturbance or errors within narrow band (ISDN) communication units attached to the transmission line.

The Examiner also acknowledges that Kumar does not teach that a switchable electrical component is provided, and that the component is connected by the impedance means depending on the detected current operating state such that the input impedance of the first transmission unit is kept to an approximately constant value. The independent claims have been amended to clarify this point. Additionally, Joffe does not disclose this feature either.

Claims 22-25 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kumar in view of Joffe, further in view of deBriggard. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons presented in the arguments set forth above.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No. 119010-108.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak

Reg. No. 43,148

Customer No. 29177

Dated: July 16, 2007